

Best Practices for INRMP Implementation



Dorothy M. Gibb, Ph.D.



2004 Conservation Conference
Savannah, Georgia

 **HORNE ENGINEERING
SERVICES, INC.**

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 01 AUG 2004		2. REPORT TYPE N/A		3. DATES COVERED -	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Best Practices for INRMP Implementation				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Horne Engineering Services, Inc.				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release, distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES See also ADM002111. Department of Defense Conservation Conference. Held in Savannah, Georgia on August 22-27, 2004, The original document contains color images.					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 17	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

Ensuring Implementation Success

What is success?



• **Military
Mission
Support**



**Who determines
success?**

Integrating Natural and Cultural
Resources with Readiness

Objective – To Improve INRMP Effectiveness and Robustness



- Installation ecosystem health
- Funding
- INRMP project completion
- Supporting the military mission
- Meeting compliance requirements
- Monitoring INRMP effectiveness

Objective – To Improve INRMP Effectiveness and Robustness



- Receiving/using stakeholder input, especially USFWS and states
- Meeting ESA requirements
- Protecting species at risk
- Adaptive
- Organizational effectiveness

Installations Selected for the Study



- MCB Camp Lejeune
- MCB Pendleton
- NAS Corpus Christi
- NAS Ingleside, NAS Kingsville
- McChord AFB
- Patrick AFB
- Fort Custer
- Fort Stewart

Conclusions so far...



- Funding is the most significant negative issue
- Ecosystem management is being accomplished – needs to be recognized
- USFWS and state agencies are rarely active partners
- USFWS staff are not familiar with Sikes Act and their role
- First class partnerships exist

Conclusions cont.



- Coordination with stakeholders is good in a few cases, but absent in rest
- Project tracking to completion is rare
- INRMP's mission support is sound
- Public's ability to review INRMPs and implementation continues to improve
- Science is sound although not apparent

Best Practices

- Fort Custer – internal coordination, especially on ITAM
- Camp Pendleton – tracking and documentation
- Patrick AFB – coordination on T&E with USFWS
- Camp Lejeune – mission support and regional initiatives
- NAS Corpus Christi, Ingleside, Kingsville – model partnership



INRMP paper review



- INRMPs from each service
- Number of installations vs. acreage under management
- No communications with the installation
- Pure read of paper/electronic copy
- Rank as Poor – Fair - Good

INRMP Paper Review Breakdown



- How many INRMPs of each service to review?
- Acreage of land managed
- Number of installation INRMPs

Paper Review (20 INRMPs)



	Acres	Bases	INRMPs
• Army	50%	47%	10
• Air Force	34%	26%	2
• Navy	8%	23%	6
• Marine Corps	8%	4%	2

INRMP Review Categories



- Military mission and organization
- **Funding, projects, and compliance**
- Adaptive management, monitoring, and ecosystem health
- Coordination w/ internal stakeholders
- Coordination w/ external stakeholders
- T&E species management

Funding, Projects and Compliance



Does the INRMP address the following?

- Funding process – specific projects, funding classes
- Additional sources of funds and their allocation
- Specific project descriptions, \$ spent, time to complete, link to goal/objective
- Tracking funded and unfunded projects

Caveat on Findings



- An INRMP doesn't necessarily reflect action on ground

However, the INRMP is

- What agencies see including for review and approval
- What public and other interested parties see

We need to improve in this area

- When we do INRMP updates
- If the INRMP is to be used in lieu of critical habitat designation

Findings: Poor→Fair→Good

- Overall - INRMPs only rank Fair
- Funding – Poor
- T&E species – Fair
- Supporting the mission, and organization – Fair



Tools to Improve Implementation



- Web publish the updated INRMP
- Track projects using data monitoring systems
- Use Web for project reporting and tracking
- Automated data collection and archiving
- Use updated INRMP Implementation Handbook www.denix.osd.mil/inrmp

The INRMP's Role Today Means Increased

- Accountability
- Scrutiny
- Flexibility
- Availability



Integrating Natural and Cultural
Resources with Readiness